



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,043	01/20/2004	Stephen Handley	WH 12 254US	7102
24962	7590	04/29/2005	EXAMINER	
DENNISON ASSOCIATES 133 RICHMOND STREET WEST SUITE 301 TORONTO, ON M5H 2L7 CANADA			BATSON, VICTOR D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3671	
DATE MAILED: 04/29/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/759,043

Applicant(s)

HANDLEY, STEPHEN

Examiner

Victor Batson

Art Unit

3671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-17 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1 line 14, "the capacity of the first "U" shaped scoop" lacks proper antecedent basis. In claim 3 line 2, it appears that "is" should be changed to "are". In claim 7 line 3, "significantly increase" is considered vague and indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6,8,10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whitnum (210,732).

Whitnum discloses a cleaning tool comprising a handle (A) extending rearwardly from a first "U" shaped scoop (B) opening upwardly with opposed sidewalls, a bottom, an end wall and a front edge opposite the end wall. Whitnum further discloses said handle (A) being shaped to define a second "U" shape scoop opening downwardly and defining a capacity which is only a small portion of the capacity of the first "U" shaped scoop as shown in figures 1 & 2. Additionally, Whitnum discloses the second scoop including a tab with a port (not identified with a letter, but shown in figures 1 & 4) at the front edge for hanging the tool when not in use.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitnum (210,732) in view of Spear et al. (5,975,601).

Whitnum discloses a cleaning tool as described previously, but lacks including gradient markings on an interior surface of the scoop.

Spear et al. teaches that it is known in the art to include gradient markings 48 on a scoop to allow the tool to be used as a measuring tool to assist the user (col 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the device of Whitnum by including gradient markings on the scoop as taught by Spear et al., to allow the user to use the tool as a measuring device.

Concerning claim 7, in figure 2A, Spear et al. shows the section of the handle near the scoop 12 having an increased thickness as compared to the handle section near the lead lines for reference numbers 23 & 14. It is well known to form the section of a hand tool with increased thickness in the area where the handle meets the tool since this is a high stress area.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the device of Whitnum by reinforcing the handle where it

Art Unit: 3671

connects to the scoop by increasing its thickness as taught by Spear et al., since this is a known way to reinforce the high stress area where the handle connects to a scoop.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitnum (210,732).

Whitnum discloses a cleaning tool as described previously, but lacks disclosing that the tab is removable.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the tool with a removable tab since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Batson whose telephone number is (571) 272-6987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Will can be reached on (571) 272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3671

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 27, 2005



Victor Batson  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3671